



Technology Literacy Challenge Grant District Application

For District Technology Planning
and/or

Hardware Acquisition To Bring The Student-to-Computer Ratio in 4th – 8th Grade
Classrooms to 10-to-1

**Deadline for Submission
June 21, 2001**

NOTE:

Grant awards based upon this application are contingent upon the U.S. Department of Education's approval of a waiver. Although the California Department of Education (CDE) does not anticipate problems or delays in securing this approval, districts should, nevertheless, understand that the timeline in this application and subsequent grant awards are contingent upon favorable action by the U.S. Department of Education.

Administered by:

The Education Technology Office
California Department of Education

Section I. Information

Overview

This program advances the five federal goals for technology in education:

- All students and teachers will have access to information technology in their classrooms, schools, communities and homes.
- All teachers will use technology effectively to help students achieve high academic standards.
- All students will have technology and information literacy skills.
- Research and evaluation will improve the next generation of technology applications for teaching and learning.
- Digital content and networked applications will transform teaching and learning.

This grant application will provide districts with funding for:

1. Technology Planning: Successful applicants will receive funding for updating or creating new technology plans consistent with the State Board of Education-adopted *Education Technology Planning: A Guide for School Districts* <<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ctl/edtechplan.pdf>> and/or;
2. Hardware Acquisition: Successful applicants will receive funding for purchasing up-to-date multimedia computers to reduce the student-to-multimedia computer ratio in grade 4th - 8th classrooms to 10-to-1.

This funding will assist successful schools in meeting the requirements to qualify for the ongoing staff development funding through the *Education Technology Staff Development Program for Grades 4-8* (AB 1339). For more information about this staff development program, visit <<http://www.cde.ca.gov/edtech/etsd>>.

Districts may apply for the technology planning funding, the hardware acquisition funding, or both. Districts applying for the hardware acquisition funding must specify the school(s) for which they wish to apply for the hardware funding. Districts must be willing to use the funding to decrease the student-to-multimedia-computer ratio in all classrooms for grades 4-8 at each school for which funding is received. Districts that apply for technology planning funding should be aware that they must, as a condition of grant acceptance, agree to develop a district technology plan consistent with the new State Board of Education-adopted *Education Technology Planning: A Guide for School Districts*. Districts will be required to work with their regional California Technology Assistance Project (CTAP) in the development of the new or revised technology plans funded through the technology planning grants. When a district believes its plan is consistent with the State Board guidelines, the district will be required to submit its plan to a statewide CTAP review committee appointed by the CDE in collaboration with CTAP. This committee will review the plan for compliance with the State Board guidelines. In the event the plan is found not to be in compliance, the district will have the opportunity to revise its plan and resubmit it for consideration. Release of the final payment will be withheld until the plan complies with the State Board guidelines. **Plans must be completed and in alignment with State Board guidelines no later than June 30, 2002** or the district will

be required to repay the technology planning funding received unless the CDE finds that extenuating circumstances exist and extends the deadline.

In addition to completing the district application, every applicant will also be required to complete the Spring 2001 California School Technology Survey for each school in the district for which the district is applying for funding. The survey may be accessed at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/edtechsurvey/>. Additional information regarding the survey may also be found at this web site.

Districts that receive hardware acquisition funding as a result of this application are strongly encouraged to use the services of the California Statewide Master Agreements for Resources in Technology (C-SMART) to help secure competitive pricing for hardware. Information about the services provided by C-SMART may be found at <http://www.c-smart.org/>.

Service to Disadvantaged Students

Funds will be awarded on a competitive basis as described in the “Funding” section below. However, applicants should be aware that this competition has been designed to give priority to school districts and schools that serve a high percentage of disadvantaged students.

1. Eligibility is restricted to districts with at least 40 percent of their total student population living in poverty, based on eligibility for free or reduced price meals in the National School Lunch or Breakfast Program. (Visit <http://www.cde.ca.gov/tlc> for a list of these districts.)
2. Additional points in the scoring process will be awarded based upon the individual schools included in the district’s application that serve:
 - a high number or percent of children living in poverty.
 - students who do not currently have access to adequate technology at school based on the Spring 2001 California School Technology Survey and 2000 California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS) data submitted by the district.
3. Applicants with 75 percent or more of their students living in poverty are eligible for individual assistance from their regional CTAP in the preparation of this application. (Visit <http://www.cde.ca.gov/tlc> for a list of these districts.)

Funding

Funding of this program is made possible through the United States Department of Education Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (Public Law 103-383, Sections 3131-3135). District Technology Planning funds will enable districts to update or create new district technology plans. Hardware acquisition funds will help districts bring schools to the 10:1 student-to-multimedia-computer ratio necessary to qualify for *Education Technology Staff Development Program for Grades 4-8* (AB 1339).

Individual grant amounts will be calculated as follows:

- Technology Planning: Funding will be based upon the number of schools in the district. Districts with 1-10 schools are eligible to receive grants up to \$10,000. Districts with 11-40 schools are eligible to receive grants of up to \$1,000 per school. Districts with 41-99 schools are eligible to receive grants of up to \$50,000 and districts with 100 or more schools are eligible to receive grants of up to \$75,000.
- Hardware Acquisition: The hardware portion of the grant will be calculated based upon \$2,000/computer for the number of computers necessary to bring the school to a 10:1 student-to-multimedia computer ratio for grades 4-8. This portion of the grant will be awarded by school in successful applications based upon free and reduced price meal eligibility, with funding going first to schools with the highest percentage of their students eligible for free and reduced price meals until all the grant moneys are allocated. In the event sufficient funding is available to provide grants to some, but not all schools at the same poverty level, awards will be based upon the amount of hardware in schools, with the funding first going to the schools with the highest student-to-multimedia-computer ratio.

Potential applicants should be aware that CDE does not anticipate sufficient funding to award hardware acquisition grants to all eligible schools. In fact, at this time, we anticipate that funding for hardware acquisition grants may only extend to schools with 70 percent or more of students eligible for free and reduced price meals.

Grant amounts will be calculated by CDE based upon 2000-2001 data submitted in October 2000 for CBEDS and by June 21, 2001, for the Spring 2001 California School Technology Survey. Applicants should be aware that in the event there is a significant discrepancy between data submitted for CBEDS and data submitted for the Spring 2001 California School Technology Survey, CDE will follow up with the district to resolve the discrepancy. CDE will determine the appropriate data to use for the purposes of calculating the grant. Applicants with questions about the calculation of grant awards should contact the Education Technology Office, California Department of Education, at (916) 323-5715.

Funding for technology planning may be spent on any expenses related to developing a district technology plan as long as those expenditures are in compliance with the federal Education Department Guidelines Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), <<http://www.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/cfrassemble.cgi?title=199834>> under Title 34 Education. Funding for hardware must be used first to purchase hardware to bring the funded school(s) to a 10-to-1 student-to-multimedia-computer ratio, or better, in all classrooms for grades 4-8. Hardware purchased with this funding must meet or exceed standards for hardware issued by the Office of the Secretary for Education (OSE). The OSE standards may be found at <<http://www.ose.ca.gov/edtech>>. Any remaining funds may be spent for education technology-related expenses at the funded school(s) as long as:

1. expenditures are consistent with EDGAR
2. any curriculum-based software purchased with grant funding is either:
 - a. part of a state-adopted program or
 - b. reviewed by the California Learning Resources Network (CLRN) and found to be consistent with State Board-adopted Content Standards unless prior approval has

been received from the CDE. Information about CLRN may be found at <http://www.clrn.org>.

Applicants for hardware acquisition funding should be aware that grant recipients will be required to report at the end of the grant whether or not they have applied for the *Education Technology Staff Development Program for Grades 4-8* funding and, if not, provide a rationale as to why they have failed to do so.

Eligibility

Eligibility is restricted to districts with at least 40 percent of their total student population living in poverty, based on eligibility for free or reduced price meals in the National School Lunch or Breakfast Program. (Visit <http://www.cde.ca.gov/tlc> for a list of these districts).

Eligible districts may submit only one application. Although districts may work together to draft applications, each district and direct-funded charter school must apply individually. Consortium applications are not allowed. Private schools are eligible to participate in sessions regarding development of revised technology plans. Districts are encouraged to contact private schools in their area and invite them to participate in this planning process.

Deadline for Submission

Complete applications must be in the possession of the California Department of Education staff **no later than 5:00 p.m. on Thursday, June 21, 2001**. See the “Required Application Components and Format” and the “How to Submit Applications” sections for additional information regarding submission of completed applications. Districts must have completed the Spring 2001 California School Technology Survey for all sites for which funding is requested by the June 21, 2001, deadline. The survey may be accessed at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/edtechsurvey/>.

Required Application Components and Format

Applications must contain the following:

1. Application title page (use the form provided in Appendix A of this application)
2. The “Certification Regarding Lobbying, Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters, and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements” (use the form provided in Appendix B of this application)
3. Application narrative (refer to Section II for the required components of this narrative). Maximum of 5 pages, plus a one-page budget form (use the form provided in Appendix C of this application) for districts applying for technology grant funding. A budget form is not required for districts applying only for hardware funding)
4. If the application is for Hardware Acquisition funding **only**, a copy of the district’s existing technology plan
5. If the application is for Hardware Acquisition funding or if it is for **both** Hardware Acquisition funding and Technology Planning funding, a completed list of schools for which the district is requesting funding. (Use the form provided in Appendix D of this application).

Instructions for completing these items are included in Section II: Instructions for Completing Applications.

Applications will be screened for compliance with format requirements. These requirements are:

1. All pages must be numbered.
2. All narrative pages must include line numbers. Pages should be individually numbered, with the first line of each page being line #1.
3. All narrative pages may not contain more than 36 lines per page. If tables or graphics are included, number or lines of text on the page must be decreased to provide room for the tables or graphics.
4. The application narrative may not exceed five (5) total pages, excluding the budget form (if this form is required).
5. If the application is for Hardware Acquisition funding **only**, the district's existing technology plan must be submitted. Note that technology plans submitted with applications are not considered part of the application narrative.

Applications will be pre-screened for compliance with these requirements by CDE. The pre-screen compliance check will address the following questions:

1. Are all of the required components included?
2. Are all pages numbered?
3. Do all narrative pages include line numbers beginning with #1 and do all of these pages contain no more than 36 lines per page?
4. Is the application narrative 5 pages or less, not including the budget form?

A “no” response to any these questions will be considered failure to comply with the format requirements. If the number of lines on one or more pages exceeds 36 lines or if an application contains more than 5 pages of narrative, the application will be “red lined.” That is, a red line will be placed at the end of the equivalent of 5 pages of 36 lines per page, and readers will be instructed not to read or score the rest of the narrative.

Penalty for failure to comply with format requirements: Applications that exceed the page restriction and/or maximum lines per page will be “red lined” as specified above. Readers will not read or score pages or lines beyond the red line. Applications that do not comply with the other format requirements will be disqualified from the competition and will be returned to the submitting agency without being scored. Applicants will not be allowed to correct deficiencies and resubmit their application for consideration in this round of competition.

In addition to the above requirements, project applicants are encouraged to format their applications in a professional and easy-to-read manner. For example, it is recommended that a minimum font size of 12 be used to promote readability throughout the entire document. It is also recommended that each application section be clearly labeled and that applications be formatted using a portrait orientation format rather than landscape orientation. Applicants are

encouraged to mark or label their current technology plan in a fashion to facilitate finding sections cited in the application narrative. Project applicants should note that the scoring rubric includes points for presentation and readability.

Reviewers will have a limited time to read each application. Their reading time will be limited to the required sections of the application. Any material not specifically required and supplementary materials such as videotapes, CD-ROMs, files on disks, commercial publications, etc., **should not** be submitted. If submitted, these items will be pulled from the application package. These items will not be reviewed when the application is scored, nor will they be returned to the applicant.

Number of Copies to Submit

Application Package

All applicants are required to submit one (1) signed, unbound original copy suitable for photocopying and three (3) stapled copies of the application. Each copy of the application must be covered with a Title Page (included as Appendix A in this application) or a reasonable facsimile. Except for the one unbound copy referenced above, all copies of the applications should be stapled or bound in such a manner that the application is flat. Do not submit applications in binders.

Existing District Technology Plan

Applicants for Hardware Acquisition Funding only must submit three (3) copies of the existing district technology plan. Applicants for Technology Planning Funding or for both Technology Planning and Hardware Acquisition Funding do not need to submit copies of their district technology plan.

How to Submit Applications

Completed applications must be in the possession of CDE staff **no later than 5:00 p.m. on Thursday, June 21, 2001**. All applications must be received on or before that date to be considered. Late submissions will not be considered. Applicants must have completed the Spring 2001 California School Technology Survey for all schools in the district for which funding is requested by the June 21, 2001, deadline.

Mailing address for applications:

Technology Literacy Challenge Grant Application
Education Technology Office
California Department of Education
515 L Street, Suite 250
Sacramento, CA 95814

Applications not received by the deadline date will not be considered for funding unless the applicant can show proof that the application was:

1. sent by registered or certified mail not later than five (5) days before the deadline date; or
2. sent by an express overnight mail service not later than one (1) day before the deadline date.

Applications delivered by hand will be accepted daily between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Pacific Daylight Time except Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays at the following address:

Education Technology Office
California Department of Education
515 L Street, Suite 250
Sacramento, CA

Applications delivered by hand on June 21, 2001, (on the deadline date) will not be accepted after 5:00 p.m. A receipt will be given for hand-delivered applications.

Process and Criteria for Awarding Grants

CDE will pre-screen applications for compliance with format requirements. As noted on page 5, applications that do not comply with these requirements will be “red lined” or returned to the submitting agency without being scored.

During July, applications will be reviewed and scored. CDE will assign a score for “Disadvantaged Students” and external panels of experts identified by the CTAP regions and by CDE will assign the remainder of the points.

The points assigned by CDE for “Disadvantaged Students” will give priority to:

- applicants serving the highest number and/or percent of children living in poverty
- applicants serving schools that are technology poor

The points assigned by CDE will be allocated based upon poverty data submitted through other reporting mechanisms and data reported on either fall 2000 CBEDS or the Spring 2001 California School Technology Survey. The points will be awarded according to the sliding scales included in Appendix E of this application.

The points assigned by external panels of experts will be allocated based upon Appendix F, the Application Scoring Rubric, for: 1) Technology Planning Grants and for 2) Technology Planning Grants and Hardware Acquisition Grants. The points assigned by external panels of experts will be allocated based upon Appendix G, the Application Scoring Rubric, for Hardware Acquisition Only.

Each application will be scored by two readers trained on using the scoring rubric. Each reader will score each application independently. If the two scores are identical or if the difference between the two scores falls within a predetermined limit, the scores are "in agreement" and the two scores will be averaged. If the difference of the two readers' ratings exceeds the limit, the application will be re-scored by the Chief Reader or another expert reader. The score assigned by that reader will be the final score.

All applications that receive at least 75 points will be considered for funding. Technology planning grants will be funded first and the remaining funding will be distributed for hardware acquisition as described in the Funding Section.

Required Conditions and Suggested Steps

Successful applicants will be required to sign a Grant Award Acceptance and Assurances form prior to receiving funding. The Grant Award will specify the payment schedule for the funds and the Assurances will include terms and conditions that must be met to receive funding. In addition, CDE is recommending that grant recipients take advantage of regional and statewide services to enhance their ability to effectively plan and use technology. The required conditions, as well as recommended actions, are listed below.

- Required conditions:

As a condition of the receipt of funds under this program, the grantee will assure that it will:

1. Maintain control of funds and title to property acquired with program funds in the public agencies.
2. Use proper methods of administering the program, including correction of any deficiencies identified through audits, monitoring, or evaluation.
3. Cooperate in carrying out any evaluation of the program conducted by or for the U. S. Secretary of Education, the CDE, or other federal or state officials.
4. Use fiscal control and fund accountability procedures as will ensure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, federal funds paid under the program, including the use of the federal funds to supplement, and not supplant, state and local funds; and maintenance of effort (20 USC § 8891).
5. Operate programs and services in compliance with Title VI and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.
6. Make reports to the state agency as may reasonably be necessary to enable the state agency to perform its duties, and maintain such records and provide access to those records as the state agency deems necessary. Such records shall include, but not be limited to, records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by the grantee of those funds, the total cost of the activity for which the funds are used, the share of that cost provided from other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit. The recipient shall maintain such records for three years after the completion of the activities for which the funds are used. (34 CFR 76.722, 76.730, 76.731, 76.734, 76.760; 34 CFR 80.42)
7. Repay any funds which have been finally determined through a federal or state audit resolution process to have been misspent, misapplied, or otherwise not properly accounted for, and further agree to pay any collection fees that may subsequently be imposed by the federal and/or state government.

-
8. Ensure that its governing board has a policy in compliance with state law requiring local educational agencies to expel from school, for a period of not less than one year, a student who is determined to have brought a firearm to school under the jurisdiction of the grantee. (20 USC § 8921, Gun Free Schools Act – see California Education Code section 48915)
 9. Make provision for the participation of private elementary and secondary schools in the technology planning process when appropriate. (ESEA, Title XIV, § 14503, (20 USC §8893))
 10. Administer the activities funded by this grant in such a manner so as to be consistent with State Academic Content Standards.
 11. Obligate all grant funds by September 30, 2002 or re-pay any funding received but not obligated.
 12. Obligate 15 percent of the grant by September 30, 2001. In the event 15 percent of the funding is not obligated by September 30, 2001, CDE reserves the right to decrease the grant award by the amount of the 15 percent of the total grant that is not obligated.
 13. Use funds to purchase multimedia computers in funded schools to reach at least a 10-to-1 student-to-multimedia computer ratio in all 4th – 8th grade classrooms.
 14. Develop or have in place a technology plan that is consistent with the State Board approved *Education Technology Planning: Guidelines for Local School Districts*. In the event that the applicant receives technology planning funding, the applicant agrees to repay the planning funding in the event the applicant never develops a technology plan consistent with the State Board guidelines.
 15. Comply with end-of-the-year reporting requirements and submit an end-of-the-year budget form by November 15, 2001, and 2002.
 16. Use hardware funding to purchase hardware that meets or exceeds standards for hardware issued by the Office of the Secretary for Education unless prior approval has been received from the CDE to purchase equipment that is not consistent with these standards. (Visit <<http://www.ose.ca.gov/pdf/techspecs.pdf>> for additional information).
 17. Any curriculum-based software purchased with grant funding must be part of a state-adopted program or be reviewed by the California Learning Resources Network (CLRN) and found to be consistent with State Board-adopted Content Standards unless prior approval has been received from the CDE. (Visit <<http://www.clrn.org>> for additional information regarding CLRN).
 18. Agree to CDE site visitations for the purpose of monitoring grant implementation and expenditures and provide all requested documentation to CDE personnel in a timely manner.
 19. Agree that CDE has the right to intervene, re-negotiate the grant, and/or cancel the grant if the grant recipient fails to comply with grant requirements.

-
20. Agree to complete: 1) an annual performance report by the deadline stipulated by CDE, 2) any evaluation data requested by CDE, and, 3) the 2002 and 2003 California School Technology Survey for all schools for which the district is applying for funding.
 21. Agree that at the time the final expenditure report is submitted, the grant recipient will report whether or not they have applied for the Education Technology Staff Development Program for Grades 4-8 funding and if not, provide a rationale as to why they have failed to do so.
 22. Agree that by the end date of the grant (September 30, 2002) at least sixty (60) percent of the teachers for grades 4-8 at schools receiving hardware acquisition funding will have completed the CTAP² self assessment at <<http://ctap2.iassessment.org/>>. This self-assessment is an online tool that allows educators to determine their level of technology proficiency (Introductory, Intermediate, or Proficient). The self-assessment is based upon rubrics established in alignment with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) "Factors to Consider," which is the technology standard for a California K-12 teaching credential.
- Recommended Steps:
All grantees will be encouraged to:
 1. Work with their CTAP region in the development and implementation of their technology plans. More information about CTAP, including a current list of regional contacts, may be found at <<http://www.cde.ca.gov/edtech/>>.
 2. Apply for the *Education Technology Staff Development Program for Grades 4-8* (AB 1339) for all schools for which hardware acquisition funding is received. For more information about this staff development program, visit <<http://www.cde.ca.gov/edtech/etsd/>>.
 3. Use the resources posted on the Technology Information Center for Administrative Leadership (TICAL) web site to assist school and district administrators understand how to develop technology plans and how to use technology to enhance teaching and learning. For more information about TICAL, visit <<http://portical.org/>>.
 4. Use the services of the California Statewide Master Agreements for Resources in Technology (C-SMART) to help secure competitive pricing for hardware. Information about the services provided by C-SMART may be found at <<http://www.c-smart.org/>>.
 5. Plan for adequate technical support to ensure that any hardware purchased with grant funding is appropriately maintained. Grantees may contract for technical support at the time of hardware purchases and/or provide this support via district or school staff.
 6. Use the services provided by the Technical Support for Education Technology in Schools (TechSETS) to assist in identification of skills needed by technical support staff and in acquiring the professional development that these staff need. More information about TechSETS may be found at <<http://www.techsets.org/>> after June 15, 2001.
 7. Encourage all teachers in the district to complete the self-assessment of technology proficiency at <<http://ctap2.iassessment.org/>>. This self-assessment, called CTAP², is

an online, self-assessment tool that allows educators to determine their level of technology proficiency (Introductory, Intermediate, or Proficient). The self-assessment is based upon rubrics established in alignment with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) "Factors to Consider," which is the technology standard for a California K-12 teaching credential.

Section II. Application Content and Scoring

Instructions for Completing Applications

Districts may apply for technology planning funding only, for hardware acquisition funding only, or both. The required content and the number of possible points for each section are described below. In addition to the requirements below, applicants for Hardware Acquisition Funding only must submit three (3) copies of the existing district technology plan.

1. Application title page:
Applicants must use the title page provided in this application and must check the appropriate box as to whether they are applying for technology planning funding, for hardware acquisition funding, or both. (See Appendix A) This page is not scored.
2. The “Certification Regarding Lobbying, Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters, and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements”
Applicants must complete and sign the forms provided in this application. (See Appendix B) This page is not scored.
3. If the application is for Hardware Acquisition funding **only** or if the application is for **both** Hardware Acquisition funding and Technology Planning funding, a list of schools for which the district is requesting funding. (Use the form provided in Appendix D of this application)
4. An application narrative: (No more than 5 pages narrative, excluding the budget form, if applicable. Note that the budget form is required under Section A below, but not under Section B.)

A. Technology Planning Only or Technology Planning and Hardware Acquisition Funding: Each application for technology planning funding and each application for technology planning and hardware acquisition funding must contain the following:

1. The need for a new or updated district technology plan (15 points): Describe the district’s need for a new or updated technology plan. This section should address whether or not the district has a technology plan and the current status of that plan. This description should address each of the five components of a district technology plan as described in the State Board’s *Education Technology Planning: A Guide for School Districts* listed below and the need to create or update the district plan in each area.
 - a. Curriculum
 - b. Professional Development
 - c. Infrastructure, Hardware, Technical Support and Software
 - d. Funding and Budget
 - e. Monitoring and Evaluation
2. Process for Developing a Plan (45 points): Describe the process for developing a new or updated technology plan. This section must include:

-
- a. A description of how the plan will be developed. This description is to include the roles and titles of persons that will provide input for developing or revising the plan, and a timeline/management chart for completion of the planning steps necessary to draft the plan.

Example:

What	Who	When
What will be done?	Who will be responsible?	When will the planning steps be completed?

- b. A budget for the project and a description of the funding that will be spent for each object of expenditure in the budget for the technology planning funding (use the form provided in Appendix C of this application). Note that the budget is needed for the technology planning funding only; it is not needed for the hardware acquisition funding. Project applicants should note that CDE encourages applicants to consider ways to develop and implement the most cost-effective program possible. Districts that receive hardware acquisition funding as a result of this application are strongly encouraged to use the services of the California Statewide Master Agreements for Resources in Technology (C-SMART) to help secure competitive pricing for hardware. Information on C-SMART services may be found at <<http://www.c-smart.org/>>.
- c. For schools that have connected their 4th - 8th grade classrooms to the Internet, include a description of how the plan will leverage this connectivity to promote effective teaching and enhance learning.
- d. For schools that currently do not have connectivity, include:
- A description of whether or not funding for connectivity has been secured.
 - If funding has been secured include the timeline for connecting all 4th - 8th grade classrooms.
 - If funding has **not** been secured include a description of the steps the district will take to identify resources for connectivity.
 - A description of how the plan will leverage connectivity when it is installed to promote effective teaching and enhance learning.
3. Monitoring and Evaluation (20 points): The evaluation section must include a description of the feedback loop used to revise plans for developing the new or revised district technology plan and, if applicable, hardware acquisition and installation in the event the development or installation is not proceeding as planned.

B. Hardware Acquisition Funding Only: Each application for hardware acquisition funding only must contain the following:

1. An analysis of how the existing district technology plan is aligned with the new State Board document, *Education Technology Planning: A Guide for School Districts* (30 points): Include specific citations for each of the five required components listed below. Also include an analysis of how the existing technology plan focuses on using technology to enhance teaching and learning.

-
- a. Curriculum
 - b. Professional Development
 - c. Infrastructure, Hardware, Technical Support and Software
 - d. Funding and Budget
 - e. Monitoring and Evaluation

Applicants should note that points will be awarded based upon the description of the current plan and the alignment of the existing plan to the State Board document.

2. A description of how the new hardware will be used to support implementation of the district technology plan in grades 4-8 (30 points): Include:
 - a. A description of how any new equipment for grades 4-8 will be used to support the goals in the existing district technology plan to improve teaching and enhance learning.
 - b. A description of the roles and titles of persons who will oversee the acquisition and installation of the hardware.

Example:

What	Who	When
What will be done?	Who will be responsible?	When will the acquisition and installation process be completed?

- c. For schools that have connected their 4th - 8th grade classrooms to the Internet include a description of how the additional hardware will be deployed so as to leverage this connectivity to promote effective teaching and enhance learning.
 - d. For schools that currently do not have connectivity, include:
 - i. A description of whether or not funding for connectivity has been secured.
 - ii. If funding has been secured include the timeline for connecting all 4th - 8th grade classrooms.
 - iii. If funding has **not** been secured include a description of the steps the district will take to identify resources for connectivity.
 - iv. A description of how the plan will leverage connectivity when it is installed to promote effective teaching and enhance learning.
3. Monitoring and Evaluation (20 points): The evaluation section must include a description of the feedback loop used to revise plans for hardware acquisition and installation in the event the acquisition or installation is not proceeding as planned.

Disadvantaged Students

A maximum of 20 points will be awarded for the Disadvantaged Students section. The CDE will assign these points. Points will be allocated independently for each of the following subsections:

- a) number or percent of students in poverty
- b) technology poor

Applicants are **not** to write a narrative for this section of the application; CDE will calculate points based only upon the data.

Number or percent of students in poverty

A maximum of 10 points will be awarded based upon the number or percent of students in participating schools who are eligible for free or reduced price meals in the National School Lunch or Breakfast Programs. (Refer to Appendix E: Score for Disadvantaged Students for the distribution of points under this item.)

Technology poor

A maximum of 10 points will be awarded for technology poor, with the most points being awarded to the applicants with the least amount of technology. (Refer to Appendix E: Score for Disadvantaged Students for the distribution of points under this item.).

Appendix A: Application Title Page

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Education Technology Literacy Challenge Grant

NOTE: Please print or type all information

APPLICATION TITLE PAGE

Return to:

California Department of Education
Education Technology Office
515 L Street, Suite 250
Sacramento, CA 95814

DEPT. OF EDUCATION USE ONLY	
Application Number	Fiscal Year
	2001

APPLICATION DEADLINE: June 21, 2001

Applying for: (check one)

- ☐ Technology Planning Funding Only
☐ Hardware Acquisition Funding Only
☐ **Both** Planning and Hardware Acquisition Funding

County/District Code

County		District	

Program CALIFORNIA TECHNOLOGY LITERACY CHALLENGE GRANT		Technology Planning Funding Request
District Name		
Address		Fax number
City	Zip Code	Email address
Primary Contact Person or Fiscal Agent	Title	Telephone
CERTIFICATION/ASSURANCE SECTION: I hereby certify that all applicable state and federal rules and regulations will be observed and that to the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this application is correct and complete.		
Printed Name of Superintendent		Telephone
Superintendent's Signature		Date

Appendix B: Certification Regarding Lobbying, Debarment, Suspension and Other responsibility Matters, and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements

Applicants should refer to the regulations cited below to determine the certification to which they are required to attest. Applicants should also review the instructions for certification included in pertinent regulations before completing this form. Signature of this form provides for compliance with certification requirements under 34 CFR Part 82, “New Restrictions on Lobbying,” and 34 CFR Part 85, “Government-Wide Debarment and Suspension (non procurement) and Government-Wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (grants).” The certifications shall be treated as a material representation of fact upon which reliance will be placed when the Department of Education determines to award the covered transaction, grant, or cooperative agreement.

1. LOBBYING—This certification is required by Section 1352, Title 31, of the U.S. Code, and 34 CFR Part 82, for persons entering into a grant or cooperative agreement over \$100,000 as defined at 34 CFR Part 82, Sections 82.105 and 82.110. The applicant certifies that:

- (a) No federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid by or on behalf of the undersigned to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency or a member of Congress in connection with the making of any federal grant; the entering into of any cooperative agreement; or the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any federal grant or cooperative agreement.
- (b) If any funds other than federal appropriated funds have been or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an employee of Congress, or any employee of a member of Congress in connection with this federal grant or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form -LLL, “Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying,” in accordance with these instructions.
- (c) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all sub-awards at all tiers (including sub-grants, contracts under grants and cooperative agreements, and subcontracts) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

2. DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS—This certification is required by executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, and other responsibilities implemented at 34 CFR Part 85, for prospective participants in primary covered transactions, as defined at 34 CFR Part 85, Sections 85.105 and 85.110.

A. The applicant certifies that he or she and any principals:

- (a) are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any federal department or agency;
- (b) have not within a three-year period preceding this application been convicted of, or had a civil judgment rendered against them, for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (federal, state, or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction violation of federal or state antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;
- (c) are not presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by, a governmental entity (federal, state, or local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1) (b) of this certification; and
- (d) have not within a three-year period proceeding this application had one or more public transactions (federal, state, or local) terminated for cause or default; and

B. Where the applicant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, he or she shall attach an explanation to this application.

3. DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE (GRANTEES OTHER THAN INDIVIDUALS) —This certification is required by the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 85, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 34 CFR Part 85, Sections 85.605 and 85.610.

A. The applicant certifies that he or she will or will continue to provide a drug-free workplace by:

- (a) publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee’s workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;
- (b) establishing an on-going drug-free awareness program to inform employees about:

-
- (1) The danger of drug abuse in the workplace;
 - (2) The grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free work plan;
 - (3) Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs; and
 - (4) The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug-abuse violations occurring in the workplace;
- (c) making it a requirement that each employee engaged in performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a);
- (d) notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will:
- (1) abide by the terms of the statement; and
 - (2) notify the employer in writing of his or her conviction of a violation;
- (e) notifying the agency, in writing, within 10 calendar days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d) (2) from an employers of convicted employees. The grantee must provide notice, including position title, to: Director, Grants, and Contracts Service, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. (Room 3124, GSA Regional Office Building No. 3), Washington, DC 20202-4571. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant;
- (f) taking one of the following actions, within 30 calendar days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d) (2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted:
- (1) taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination, consistent with the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; or
 - (2) requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a federal, state, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency; and.
- (g) making a good-faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f).

B. The grantee may insert in the space provided below the site(s) for the performance of work done in connection with the specific grant:

Place of performance (street address, city, county, state, zip code): _____

ENVIRONMENTAL TOBACCO SMOKE ACT—This certification is required by the Pro-Children Act of 1994, (also known as Environmental Tobacco Smoke), and implemented as Public Law 103-277, Part C which requires that:

The applicant certifies that smoking is not permitted in any portion of any indoor facility owned or leased or contracted and used routinely or regularly for the provision of health care services, day care, and education to children under the age of 18. Failure to comply with the provisions of this law may result in the imposition of a civil monetary penalty of up to \$1,000 per day. (The law does not apply to children's services provided in private residence, facilities funded solely by Medicare or Medicaid funds, and portions of facilities used for in-patient drug and alcohol treatment).

Check ☐ if there are workplaces on file that are not identified here.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I hereby certify that the applicant will comply with the above certifications.

NAME OF APPLICANT

PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE

SIGNATURE

DATE

Appendix C:
Budget for Technology Planning Funding

Major Object of Expenditure Categories	Amount Requested	Description of How The Amount Requested was Calculated and How the Funding Will Be Used to Support Development of a District Technology Plan
1000-1999 Certificated Personnel Salaries		
2000-2999 Classified Personnel Salaries		
3000-3999 Employee Benefits		
4000-4999 Books and Supplies		
5000-5999 Services and Other Operating Expenditures		
Indirect Costs at the district's approved rate (excluding the 6000- 6999 category)		
6000-6999 Capital Outlay		
TOTAL		

Appendix E: Score for Disadvantaged Students

The California Department of Education will assign a maximum of 20 points for disadvantaged students. The points will be allocated based upon weighted averages for all districts. Points will be assigned as follows:

1. Service to a high number or percent of students in poverty:

A maximum of 10 points will be assigned for service to a high number or percent of students living in poverty, as defined by eligibility for free or reduced price meals in the National School Lunch or Breakfast Programs.

Service to a high percent of students living in poverty (calculated using data on the schools to be served)	51-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Points to be awarded:	2	4	6	8	10

Service to a large number of students in poverty (calculated by comparing the number of students in poverty to be served with the average number to be served from all applications).	110-129%	130-149%	150-169%	170-189%	>190%
Points to be awarded:	2	4	6	8	10

a) Percent of students in poverty to be served under this application: _____

b) Number of students in poverty to be served:

Number of students in poverty to be served under this application _____

Average number of students in poverty to be served under all applications _____

Percent of students in poverty to be served compared to the average _____

Points allocated for disadvantaged students _____

2. Technology Poor:

A maximum of 10 points will be assigned for technology poor, with the most points being awarded to the applicants with the least amount of technology. Points will be awarded based upon the student-to-multimedia computer ratio, with the most points going to the applicants with the least technology.

Student-to-multimedia-computer ratio	11:1 to <12:1	12:1 to <23:1	23:1 to <25:1	25:1 to <30:1	30:1 or over
Points to be awarded:	2	4	6	8	10

Average student-to-multimedia-computer ratio in schools for which funding is requested: _____

Points allocated for technology poor: _____

Appendix F:
Technology Literacy Challenge Technology Planning/Hardware Acquisition
Application Scoring Rubric
Reader's Score Sheet

Name of Lead Agency: _____

Reviewer's Name _____

County/District Code of Lead Agency _____

Proposal Number _____

I certify that I am able to review this application in an unbiased and objective manner and with no personal conflict of interest. _____ <div style="text-align: right; font-size: small;">Signature of the Reviewer</div>

Technology Planning /Hardware Acquisition: Application Presentation

Key Issues and Questions		Acceptable 5 points		Not Acceptable 0 points
<p>Successful projects are professionally presented. The format makes the application easy to read and understand.</p> <p>Questions to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the font large enough to read easily? Are major sections of the application clearly labeled? Is the application's presentation clear and organized and free of spelling and grammar errors? Is the application formatted in a portrait orientation? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The font is large enough to read easily (for example, it is a 12-point font). The required sections of the application are clearly labeled. The application is well organized and easy to understand. There are no spelling and/or grammatical errors. The application is formatted in a portrait orientation. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The font size in all or part of the application is so small that it interferes with easy reading. Different sections are not generally labeled or section titles do not correspond with required sections. The application is vague or choppy. The application contains numerous spelling and grammar errors. The application is formatted in a landscape orientation.

Notes and comments:

Application Presentation	Maximum Possible Score: 5 points	Score Assigned by the Reader: _____
---------------------------------	---	---

Technology Planning/Hardware Acquisition: Planning Need

Key Issues and Questions	Makes a Strong Case 15-11 points	Makes an Adequate Case 10-5 points	Makes an Inadequate Case 4-0 points
<p>Successful projects effectively identify need for a new or updated district technology plan.</p> <p>Questions to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the application include a complete description of the need for a new or updated plan, including the current status of that plan? Does the application describe the need for writing or updating the District Technology Plan for each of the five component areas? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Curriculum Professional Development Infrastructure Hardware, Technical Support and Software Funding and Budget Monitoring and Evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The application includes a convincing description of the district's need for a new or updated technology plan. Each of the five component areas has been systematically and clearly addressed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The application includes a description of the district's need for a new or updated technology plan. Details are lacking and the need has not been as clearly communicated as applications scoring in the "strong case" category. All five component areas have been addressed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The application includes a vague and/or minimal description of the district's need for a new or updated technology plan. Some of the component areas may be missing or the description is too superficial to be helpful to the reader.

Notes and comments:

Planning Need	Maximum Possible Score:	Score Assigned by the Reader:
	15 points	_____

Technology Planning/Hardware Acquisition: Process for Developing a Plan

Key Issues and Questions	Makes a Strong Case 45-30 points	Makes an Adequate Case 29-14 points	Makes an Inadequate Case 13-0 points
<p>Successful projects effectively describe the process for developing a new or updated technology plan.</p> <p>Questions to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the application include a complete description of how the plan will be developed? Are roles and titles of those developing the plan identified? Does the budget reflect thoughtful consideration of expenditures? Will the budget support the development of a quality plan? Has a realistic timeline been incorporated? Is the plan likely to address the issue of technology as a tool to promote effective teaching and enhance learning? Has connectivity been addressed in such a way to clearly connect to promoting effective teaching and enhanced learning? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders have been identified; sufficient representatives have been included in the planning process. Roles and titles of those developing the plan have been clearly identified. A realistic timeline/management chart has been included to detail the planning steps for completion of the technology plan. A realistic budget and description of the funding by object of expenditure has been included. The budget will support development of a quality plan. There is evidence of collaboration during the planning process. If applicable, a clear description of how the plan will leverage connectivity to promote effective teaching and enhance learning has been included. If applicable, a clear description of how the district will identify resources for connectivity has been included. It is clear that the process will focus on using technology as a tool to promote effective teaching and enhance learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders are identified, but representation is minimal. Roles and responsibilities of those developing the plan lack detail to give the reader a complete understanding of who will be responsible for what. A timeline has been included; some key elements may have been overlooked or the timeline may be somewhat unrealistic. A budget and description of funding have been included. Details may be lacking for the reader to fully understand how the costs directly relate to the process of plan development. Some evidence of collaboration has been included. If applicable, a description of how the plan will leverage connectivity to promote effective teaching and learning has been included. If applicable, a description of how the district will identify resources for connectivity has been included. Some evidence is included to indicate that the process will address using technology as a tool to promote effective teaching and enhance learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little evidence of stakeholder inclusion in the planning process has been included in the application. Roles and responsibilities of those developing the plan are vague or missing. The timeline is incomplete, missing or very unrealistic. The budget and description of funding may be unrealistic, lacking detail and/or missing from the application. There is no evidence of collaboration in the planning process or the description is very vague. The overall description of the planning process is weak. It is unclear that the process will focus on improving teaching and learning.

Notes and comments:

Plan Process	Maximum Possible Score:	Score Assigned by the Reader:
	45 points	<hr/>

Technology Planning/Hardware Acquisition: Monitoring and Evaluation

Key Issues and Questions	Makes a Strong Case 20-12 points	Makes an Adequate Case 11-5 points	Makes an Inadequate Case 4-0 points
<p>Successful projects include an effective plan for monitoring and evaluation.</p> <p>Questions to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the application include a description of an effective process for feedback used to solicit input and revisions to the plan? Has a description been included for evaluating the effectiveness of the technology planning? If applicable, does the application include a description of plan for monitoring the hardware acquisition and installation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan for monitoring of the technology planning process is thoroughly described. The process includes a mechanism for soliciting feedback and incorporating revisions where needed. A detailed description of the process that will be used to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the technology planning has been included. The process is detailed enough so that readers have a clear understanding of what the process will be, who will participate and how information will be shared among stakeholders. If applicable, the plan for monitoring the hardware acquisition/installation process is thoroughly described. The process includes a mechanism for soliciting feedback and incorporating revisions where needed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan for monitoring of the technology planning process is adequately described. A feedback loop is mentioned, but there is not as much detail as in a "strong case." A description of the process that will be used to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the technology planning has been included. The process is somewhat detailed so that readers have a good idea of what the process will be, who will participate and how information will be shared among stakeholders. If applicable, the plan for monitoring the hardware acquisition/installation has been included and has been adequately described. A process for soliciting feedback and incorporating revisions is mentioned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan for monitoring of the technology planning process is either somewhat described or is missing. Limited detail makes determining the feedback loop difficult to understand. The description of the process that will be used to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the technology planning is missing or too vague to be helpful. It is not clear what the process will be, who will participate or how the information will be shared with others. There is little or no evidence of a feedback loop. The application includes a request for hardware acquisition funding, but the application either does not address a plan for monitoring the acquisition and installation of that hardware, or the description lacks the information necessary to understand how this process will be monitored and/or what process will be followed if the acquisition and/or installation is not proceeding as planned.

Notes and comments:

Monitoring and Evaluation	Maximum Possible Score: 20 points	Score Assigned by the Reader: _____
----------------------------------	--	---

Score Sheet Summary Technology Planning/Hardware Acquisition

Name of Lead Agency: _____

Reviewer's Name _____

County/District Code of Lead Agency _____

Proposal Number _____

<u>Rubric Section</u>	<u>Maximum Possible Points</u>	<u>Points Assigned by the Reader</u>
Application Presentation	5	_____
Program Description	15	_____
Process for Developing a Plan	45	_____
Monitoring and Evaluation	20	_____
Subtotal		_____
Additional points for Technology Poverty	(0-10)	_____
Additional points for Economic Poverty	(0-10)	_____
Total Score		=====

I certify that the scores on this page reflect my unbiased and
objective judgment of this application.

Signature of the Reviewer

Appendix G:
Technology Literacy Challenge Hardware Acquisition Only
Application Scoring Rubric
Reader's Score Sheet

Name of Lead Agency: _____

Reviewer's Name _____

County/District Code of Lead Agency _____

Proposal Number _____

I certify that I am able to review this application in an unbiased and objective manner and with no personal conflict of interest.

Signature of the Reviewer

Hardware Acquisition Only: Application Presentation

Key Issues and Questions		Acceptable 5 points			Not Acceptable 0 points
<p>Successful projects are professionally presented. The format makes the application easy to read and understand.</p> <p>Questions to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the font large enough to read easily? Are major sections of the application clearly labeled? Is the application's presentation clear and organized and free of spelling and grammar errors? Is the application formatted in a portrait orientation? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The font is large enough to read easily (for example, it is a 12-point font). The required sections of the application are clearly labeled. The application is well organized and easy to understand. There are no spelling and/or grammatical errors. The application is formatted in a portrait orientation. 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The font size in all or part of the application is so small that it interferes with easy reading. Different sections are not generally labeled or section titles do not correspond with required sections. The application is vague or choppy. The application contains numerous spelling and grammar errors. The application is formatted in a landscape orientation.

Notes and comments:

Application Presentation	Maximum Possible Score: 5 points	Score Assigned by the Reader: _____
---------------------------------	--	---

Hardware Acquisition Only: Analysis of the Existing District Technology Plan

Key Issues and Questions	Makes a Strong Case 30- 21 points	Makes an Adequate Case 20-10 points	Makes an Inadequate Case 9-0 points
<p>Successful projects effectively describe their integrated technology plan.</p> <p>Questions to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the application include a complete analysis of how the district's current technology plan is aligned with the <i>Education Technology Planning: A Guide for School Districts</i>, including citations for each component area? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Curriculum Professional Development Infrastructure Hardware, Technical Support and Software Funding and Budget Monitoring and Evaluation Does the plan focus on using technology as a tool to promote effective teaching and enhanced learning? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The application includes a thorough analysis of how the district's current technology plan is aligned with the new State Board document, including citations for each component area. Each of the five component areas has been systematically and clearly addressed in the plan and is up to date. It is clear that the plan focuses on using technology as a tool to promote effective teaching and enhanced learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The application includes a description of the district's current technology plan. Details are lacking and the content has not been as clearly communicated as applications scoring in the "strong case" category. All five component areas have been addressed. Some evidence is included to indicate that the plan addresses using technology as a tool to promote effective teaching and enhanced learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The application includes a vague and/or minimal description of the district's current technology plan. Some of the component areas may be incomplete and/or missing. It is unclear whether the technology plan focuses on improving teaching and learning or the plan is so vague that it is questionable whether it will guide the district in using technology to promote improved teaching and learning.

Notes and comments:

Analysis of The Existing District Technology Plan	Maximum Possible Score: 30 points	Score Assigned by the Reader: _____
--	--	---

Technology Planning Grant: How the New Hardware Will be Used to Support Implementation of the District Technology Plan

Key Issues and Questions	Makes a Strong Case 30- 21 points	Makes an Adequate Case 20-10 points	Makes an Inadequate Case 9-0 points
<p>Successful projects effectively describe how the additional hardware will be used to support implementation of the district's technology plan.</p> <p>Questions to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the application include a complete description of how the new equipment will be used to support the goals in the district's technology plan? Does the application include a complete description of the title and role/responsibility of the person(s) who will be overseeing the acquisition and installation of hardware? Has connectivity been addressed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A clear description has been included that addresses how the new equipment will be used to support the goals in the district's technology plan. The description clearly details the title and role/responsibility of the person(s) who will be overseeing the acquisition and installation of hardware and the corrective steps that will be taken in case the process does not go as planned. A detailed description of the issue of connectivity has been included that includes funding sources and leveraging when appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An adequate description of how the new hardware will be used to support the goals in the district's technology plan has been included. There are not as many details as in "Makes a Strong Case." The title and role/responsibility of the person(s) who will be overseeing the acquisition and installation of hardware have been listed. Corrective steps that will be taken in case the process does not go as planned are adequately described. Connectivity has been somewhat addressed, but there are not as many details as in "Makes a Strong Case." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The description of how the new hardware will be used to support the goals in the district's technology plan is unclear and/or superficially addressed. It is difficult to determine who will be overseeing the acquisition and installation of hardware and/or what their role will be in the process. Corrective steps that will be taken in case the process does not go as planned are vague and/or missing. Connectivity has not been adequately addressed. The description may be too vague to assist readers in determining the current and/or future status of this issue.

Notes and comments:

How The New Hardware Will Be Used To Support Implementation	Maximum Possible Score: 30 points	Score Assigned by the Reader: _____
--	--	---

Hardware Acquisition Only: Monitoring and Evaluation

Key Issues and Questions		Makes a Strong Case 20-12 points	Makes an Adequate Case 11-5 points	
<p>Successful projects include an effective plan for monitoring and evaluation.</p> <p>Questions to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the application include a description of an effective process for feedback used to solicit input and revisions to the plans for hardware acquisition and installation? Has a plan been included for continuous monitoring/evaluation of the process? 	<p>♦ The plan for monitoring the hardware acquisition/installation process is thoroughly described. The process includes a mechanism for soliciting feedback and incorporating revisions where needed. The process is detailed enough so that readers have a clear understanding of what the process will be, who will participate, and how information will be shared among stakeholders.</p>	<p>♦ The plan for monitoring the hardware acquisition/installation process is adequately described. A feedback loop is mentioned, but there is not as much detail as “Makes a Strong Case.” The process is detailed enough so that readers have an adequate idea of what the process will be, who will participate, and how information will be shared among stakeholders.</p>	<p>♦ The plan for monitoring of the hardware acquisition/installation process is somewhat described. Limited detail makes determining the feedback loop difficult to understand. The process lacks detail to give the reader enough information to determine what the process will be, who will participate, or how information will be shared among stakeholders.</p>	

Notes and comments:

Monitoring and Evaluation	Maximum Possible Score: 20 points	Score Assigned by the Reader: _____
----------------------------------	--	---

Score Sheet Summary Hardware Acquisition Only

Name of Lead Agency: _____

Reviewer's Name _____

County/District Code of Lead Agency _____

Proposal Number _____

<u>Rubric Section</u>	<u>Maximum Possible Points</u>	<u>Points Assigned by the Reader</u>
Application Presentation	5	_____
Analysis of the Existing District Technology Plan	30	_____
How the New Hardware will be Used to Support Implementation of the District Technology Plan	30	_____
Monitoring and Evaluation	20	_____
Subtotal		_____
Additional points for Technology Poverty	(0-10)	_____
Additional points for Economic Poverty	(0-10)	_____
Total Score		=====

I certify that the scores on this page reflect my unbiased and
objective judgment of this application.

Signature of the Reviewer